



APR 11 2006

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 2838

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor : Kevin I. Bertness	
Appln. No.: 10/681,666	Group Art Unit: 2838
Filed : October 8, 2003	
For : ELECTRONIC BATTERY TESTER WITH PROBE LIGHT	Examiner: Edward H. Tso
Docket No.: C382.12-0169	

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING  
SENT BY U.S. MAIL, FIRST CLASS, TO THE  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450,  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450, THIS

5<sup>th</sup> DAY OF MAY, 2006

*A. Rego*  
PATENT ATTORNEY

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated March 7, 2006. In the Office Action, all pending claims 1-27 were rejected. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

On Page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertness (US 6,316,914) in view of Applicant's own admitted prior art. The above rejection on page 2 of the Office Action was addressed in a previous response filed on January 6, 2006.

In response to the Applicant's general argument that the references cited in the previous Office Action do not show any teaching or suggestion that relates to combining a torch with a battery tester cable, the final Office Action states that combining a light source with a device is common and well known, and lists additional references to support this conclusion.